

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	PLICATION NO. FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR Hiroshi Kajimaru	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 0020-4908P-SP	CONFIRMATION NO. 6933
09/961,412 09/25/2001		09/25/2001			
2292	7590	06/27/2003			
BIRCH ST PO BOX 74		KOLASCH & BI	EXAMINER		
	747 CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			YOON, TAE H	
				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				1714	
				DATE MAILED: 06/27/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary	07/70/,9/2 Examiner	Kajimaru et of	
,	Examiner /	Group Art Unit	
-The MAII ING DATE of this communication one		1114	
- The MAILING DATE of this communication app.  Period for Reply	ears on the cover sneet b	eneath the correspondence address—	
	11067		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.			
<ul> <li>Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 (from the mailing date of this communication.</li> <li>If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days</li> <li>If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by defending to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by</li> <li>Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).</li> </ul>	s, a reply within the statutory minefault, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application	nimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. rom the mailing date of this communication.	
Status			
☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on			
☐ This action is <b>FINAL.</b>		•	
<ul> <li>Since this application is in condition for allowance excacordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1</li> </ul>	cept for formal matters, pro	secution as to the merits is closed in	
Disposition of Claims			
x Claim(s) 1−12		is/are pending in the application	
Of the above claim(s)	is/are withdrawn from consideration		
☐ Claim(s)		in form all a	
Ø Claim(s) 1 − 12		is/are rejected.	
□ Claim(s)		is/are objected to.	
□ Claim(s)		are subject to restriction or election	
Application Papers		requirement	
☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on		☐ disapproved.	
☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are ob	jected to by the Examiner		
☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.			
☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.	1		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)–(d)			
Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priorit	ty under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)	⊢(d).	
All □ Some* □ None of the:			
Certified copies of the priority documents have bee	n received.		
☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been	n received in Application N	o	
Coming of the southful and the	ents have been received		
□ Copies of the certified copies of the priority document			
<ul> <li>Copies of the certified copies of the priority docume in this national stage application from the Internatio</li> </ul>			
<ul> <li>□ Copies of the certified copies of the priority docume in this national stage application from the Internatio</li> <li>*Certified copies not received:</li> </ul>			
□ Copies of the certified copies of the priority docume in this national stage application from the Internatio *Certified copies not received:  *Attachment(s)		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
□ Copies of the certified copies of the priority docume in this national stage application from the Internatio *Certified copies not received:  *Attachment(s)  Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper	No(s) ln	iterview Summary, PTO-413	
☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority docume in this national stage application from the Internatio  *Certified copies not received:  Attachment(s)	No(s)   In	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	

Office Action Summary

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTO-326 (Rev. 11/00)

Part of Paper No.

Art Unit: 1714

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- (e) (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United

States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effect under this subsection of a national application published under section 122(b) only if the international application designating the United States was published under Article 21(2)(a) of such treaty in the English language; or

(2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that a patent shall not be deemed filed in the United States for the purposes of this subsection based on the filing of an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a); or

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Lewarchik et al (US 5,484,842).

Lewarchik et al teach the instant aqueous polyester dispersion free of an organic solvent and a coating thereof with a curing agent (Cymel) in abstract, examples and claim 10. The acid

Art Unit: 1714

numbers of 30-100 and the weight average molecular weight of 1000-20,000 encompass the instantly claimed values. Thus, the instant invention lacks novelty.

Claims 1, 2, 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Hintze-Bruning et al (US 6,180,180).

Hintze-Bruning et al teach aqueous composition comprising a polyester (A1) dispersion in abstract and at col. 18, lines 24-44 wherein an acid number of 36.4 is seen. Said polyester (A1) has the instant molecular weight (col. 3, line 62-col. 4, line 10), and note that the weight average molecular weight of a polymer is higher than the number average molecular weight since the polydispersity (Mn/Mw) of a polymer is higher than 1. Example at col. 18, lines 24-44 utilizing mulifunctional polyol, neopentyl glycol, would have yielded a high polydispersity due to branching. The use of an organic solvent in the aqueous coating composition is taught as an optional practice, 0-20 wt.%, at col. 17, lines 29-40. Thus, the instant invention lacks novelty.

Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Hintze-Bruning et al (US 6,180,180) alone, or in view of Fujita et al (US 5,869,567).

Hintze-Bruning et al teach employing two polyols at col. 18, lines 24-44, and the instant ethylene glycol and propanediols at col. 4, line 53. Also, the removal of cyclohexane and isopropoxypropanol from the dispersion of a polyester (A1) in order to obtain the aqueous coating composition without an organic solvent would be a *prima facie* obviousness since Hintze-

Application/Control Number: 09/961,412

Art Unit: 1714

Bruning et al teach an organic solvent being an option. Fujita et al teach an aqueous dispersion of a polyester using ethylene glycol and neopentyl glycol in table 1.

Page 4

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to utilize ethylene glycol and neopentyl glycol or ethylene glycol and propanediol in said teaching at col. 18, lines 24-44 of Hintze-Bruning et al wihtout/ or with teaching of Fujita et al since Hintze-Bruning et al suggest the use of such polyols, and further to remove organic solvents from the coating composition thereof since Hintze-Bruning et al teach an organic solvent being an option and since a coating composition without or very little organic solvent is a preferred practice due to a consideration of the health and environment.

Claims 1-3 and 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Tachika et al (US 5,356,989).

Tachika et al teach an aqueous polyester dispersion of polyester in abstract. Polyesters are taught in table 1 wherein the instant molecular weight (Mw is higher than Mn) is seen. Acid numbers of said table meet the instant acid values in view of teaching at col. 5, lines 48-59. Note that an organic solvent is an optional component as evidenced by teaching at col. 2, line 65, B/(B+C) = 0 - 0.7. The use of crosslinking agents is taught at col. 8, lines 25-35. Thus, the instant invention lacks novelty.

Application/Control Number: 09/961,412

Art Unit: 1714

Claims 1-4 and 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Tachika et al

(US 5,356,989).

The instant claim 4 recites ethylene glycol and 1,2-propanediol (propylene glycol) over

Tachika et al. But, Tachika et al teach the use of a mixture of polyols in table 1 and said 1,2-

propanediol (propylene glycol) at col. 5, lines 30-31.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant

invention to utilize ethylene glycol and 1,2-propanediol in examples of Tachika et al and to obtain

an organic solvent-free aqueous coating composition thereof since Tachika et al teach the use of a

mixture of polyols in table 1 and equate various polyols and since Tachika et al teach an organic

solvent being an option and since a coating composition without an organic solvent is a preferred

practice due to a consideration of the health and environment.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tae H. Yoon whose telephone number is (703) 308-2389. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday from 8:00 to 5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vasu Jagannathan, can be reached on (703) 306-2777. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9310.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

THY/June 24, 2003

TAE H. YOON
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Tackelforn

Page 5